arXiv:1008.4614v1 [math.AP] 26 Aug 2010

RADIAL CONVEX SOLUTIONS OF BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS FOR SYSTEMS OF MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATIONS

Haiyan Wang

Division of Mathematical and Natural Sciences
Arizona State University
Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100, U.S.A.
E-mail: wangh@asu.edu

Abstract

The existence, multiplicity and nonexistence of nontrivial radial convex solutions of a system of two weakly coupled Monge-Ampère equations are established with asymptotic assumptions for an appropriately chosen parameter. The proof of the results is based on Krasnoselskii's fixed point theorem in a cone.

Keywords: system of Monge-Ampère equations, convex radial solution, existence, Krasnoselskii's fixed point theorem
MSC: 34B15; 35J96

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the existence of convex solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the weakly coupled system

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\big(u_1'(r)\big)^N\Big)' = \lambda N t^{N-1} f(-u_2(r)) \quad \text{in } \ 0<r<1,\\
&\Big(\big(u_2'(r)\big)^N\Big)' = \lambda N t^{N-1} g(-u_1(r)) \quad \text{in } \ 0<r<1,\\
&u_1'(0)=u_2'(0)=0, \ \ u_1(1)=u_2(1)=0,
\end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $N \geq 1$. A nontrivial convex solution of (1.2) is negative on [0,1). Such a problem arises in the study of the existence of convex radial solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the system of the Monge-Ampère equations

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\det(D^2u_1) = \lambda f(-u_2) \ \text{ in } \ B,\\
\det(D^2u_2) = \lambda g(-u_1) \ \text{ in } \ B,\\
u_1 = u_2 = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \partial B,
\end{array}\right. \tag{1.2}$$

where $B = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x| < 1\}$ and $\det D^2 u_i$ is the determinant of the Hessian matrix $(\frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial x_m \partial x_n})$ of u_i. For radial solution $u_i(r)$ with $r = \sqrt{\sum_1^N x_i^2}$, the Monge-

Ampère operator simply becomes

$$\det(D^2 u_i) = \frac{(u_i')^{N-1} u_i''}{r^{N-1}} = \frac{1}{N r^{N-1}} ((u_i')^N)' \tag{1.3}$$

and then (1.1) can be easily transformed into (1.2). (1.3) is frequently used in the literature, see the references [2, 7] on radial solutions of the Monge-Ampère equations and others, e.g., Caffarelli and Li [1]. It can be derived from the fact that the Monge-Ampère operator is rotationally invariant, see, for example, [4, Appendix A.2].

Much attention has been focused on the study of single Monge-Ampère equations. Radial solutions of the boundary value problem with a single Monge-Ampère equations satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\left(u_1'(r)\right)^N\right)' = \lambda f(-u(r)) \;\; r \in (0,1) \\ &u'(0) = 0, \;\; u(1) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Kutev [7] investigated the existence of strictly convex radial solutions of (1.4) with $f(-u) = (-u)^p$. Delano [2] treated the existence of convex radial solutions of (1.4) for a class of more general functions, namely $\lambda \exp f(|x|, u, |\nabla u|)$.

By using Krasnoselskii's fixed point theorem, the author [9], and Hu and the author [3] showed that the existence, multiplicity and nonexistence of convex radial solutions of (1.4) can be determined by the asymptotic behaviors of the quotient $\frac{f(u)}{u^N}$ at zero and infinity. In a recent paper, the author [11] proved analogous results for general systems. Note that the general system in [11] do not include (1.1).

In this paper we shall continue to establish the existence, multiplicity and nonexistence of convex radial solutions of the weakly coupled system (1.1) (and (1.2)) for various combinations of asymptotic behavior of f, g at zero and infinity based on Krasnoselskii's fixed point theorem. The author [10] showed the existence of convex redial solutions of (1.1) in superlinear and sublinear cases.

First, let

$$f_0 = \lim_{x \to 0^+} \frac{f(x)}{x^N}, \quad f_\infty = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x^N},$$

and

$$g_0 = \lim_{x \to 0^+} \frac{g(x)}{x^N}, \quad g_\infty = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{g(x)}{x^N}.$$

The main results in [10] is Theorem 1.1. We include and prove it here only for completeness.

Theorem 1.1 *[10] Assume $f, g : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ are continuous.*
(a). If $f_0 = g_0 = 0$ and $f_\infty = g_\infty = \infty$, then (1.1) (and (1.2)) has a nontrivial convex solution for all $\lambda > 0$.
(b). If $f_0 = g_0 = \infty$ and $f_\infty = g_\infty = 0$, then (1.1) (and (1.2)) has a nontrivial convex solution for all $\lambda > 0$.

Our main results in this paper are:

Theorem 1.2 *Assume $f, g : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ are continuous and $f(x) > 0, g(x) > 0$ for $x > 0$.*
(a). If either $f_0 = g_0 = 0$, or $f_\infty = g_\infty = 0$, then there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > \lambda_0$ (1.1) (and (1.2)) has a nontrivial convex solution.
(b). If either $f_0 = g_0 = \infty$, or $f_\infty = g_\infty = \infty$, then there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$ (1.1) (and (1.2)) has a nontrivial convex solution.
(c). If $f_0 = g_0 = f_\infty = g_\infty = 0$, then there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > \lambda_0$ (1.1) (and (1.2)) has two nontrivial convex solutions.
(d). If $f_0 = g_0 = f_\infty = g_\infty = \infty$, then there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$ (1.1) (and (1.2)) has two nontrivial convex solutions.
(e). If $f_0, g_0, f_\infty, g_\infty < \infty$, then there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$ (1.1) (and (1.2)) has no nontrivial convex radial solution.
(f). If $f_0, g_0, f_\infty, g_\infty > 0$, then there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > \lambda_0$ (1.1) (and (1.2)) has no nontrivial convex radial solution.

Remark 1.3 A nontrivial solution $(u_1(r), u_2(r))$ of (1.1) has at least one nonzero component. It is possible that one of its components is zero. $(v_i(r), v_2(r)) = (-u_1(r), -u_2(r))$ is a nontrivial solution to (2.5) or a positive fixed point of $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ in (2.6). From the integral expression (2.6), we have for $r \in (0,1)$

$$v_1'(r) = -\big(\lambda \int_0^r N\tau^{N-1} f(v_2(t))d\tau\big)^{\frac{1}{N}}$$

and

$$v_2'(r) = -\big(\lambda \int_0^r N\tau^{N-1} g(v_1(t))d\tau\big)^{\frac{1}{N}}$$

Therefore, each component $u_i'(r) = -v_i'(r)$ is nondecreasing and $u_i = -v_i(r), i = 1,2$ are convex.

Remark 1.4 Apparently the intervals of the parameter λ for ensuring the existence of convex solutions of (1.1) are not necessarily optimal. The estimates of the operator in Section 2 can be improved. We will address them in the future.

2 Preliminaries

With a simple transformation $v_i = -u_i, i = 1,2$ (1.1) can be brought to the following equation

$$\begin{cases} \Big(\big(-v_1'(r)\big)^N\Big)' & = \lambda N r^{N-1} f(v_2), \quad 0 < r < 1, \\ \Big(\big(-v_2'(r)\big)^N\Big)' & = \lambda N r^{N-1} g(v_1), \quad 0 < r < 1, \\ v_i'(0) = v_i(1) & = 0, \quad i = 1,2. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

Now we treat positive concave classical solutions of (2.5).

We recall some concepts and conclusions of an operator in a cone. Let X be a Banach space and K be a closed, nonempty subset of X. K is said to be a cone if (i) $\alpha u + \beta v \in K$ for all $u, v \in K$ and all $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ and (ii) $u, -u \in K$ imply $u = 0$. We shall employ Krasnoselskii's fixed point theorem to prove Theorems 1.1, 1.2.

Lemma 2.1 ([5, 6]) *Let X be a Banach space and K $(\subset X)$ be a cone. Assume that $\Omega_1,\ \Omega_2$ are bounded open subsets of X with $0 \in \Omega_1, \bar{\Omega}_1 \subset \Omega_2$, and let*

$$T : K \cap (\bar{\Omega}_2 \setminus \Omega_1) \to K$$

be completely continuous such that either

(i) $\|Tu\| \geq \|u\|,\ u \in K \cap \partial\Omega_1$ *and* $\|Tu\| \leq \|u\|,\ u \in K \cap \partial\Omega_2$*; or*

(ii) $\|Tu\| \leq \|u\|,\ u \in K \cap \partial\Omega_1$ *and* $\|Tu\| \geq \|u\|,\ u \in K \cap \partial\Omega_2$.

Then T has a fixed point in $K \cap (\bar{\Omega}_2 \backslash \Omega_1)$.

In order to apply Lemma 2.1 to (2.5), let X be the Banach space $C[0,1] \times C[0,1]$ and, for $(v_1, v_2) \in X$,

$$\|(v_1, v_2)\| = \|v_1\| + \|v_2\|$$

where $\|v_i\| = \sup_{t\in[0,1]}|v_i(t)|$. Define K to be a cone in X by

$$K = \{(v_1, v_2) \in X : v_i(t) \geq 0,\ t \in [0,1], \min_{\frac{1}{4}\leq t\leq\frac{3}{4}} v_i(t) \geq \frac{1}{4}\|v_i\|, i = 1, 2\}.$$

For $r > 0$ let

$$\Omega_r = \{(v_1, v_2) \in K : \|(v_1, v_2)\| < r\}.$$

Note that $\partial\Omega_r = \{(v_1, v_2) \in K : \|(v_1, v_2)\| = r\}$. Further let $\mathbf{T}_\lambda : K \to X$ be a map with components $(T^1_\lambda, T^2_\lambda)$, which are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} T^1_\lambda(v_1, v_2)(r) &= \int_r^1 \Big(\lambda \int_0^s N\tau^{N-1} f(v_2(\tau))d\tau\Big)^{\frac{1}{N}} ds,\ r \in [0,1], \\ T^2_\lambda(v_1, v_2)(r) &= \int_r^1 \Big(\lambda \int_0^s N\tau^{N-1} g(v_1(\tau))d\tau\Big)^{\frac{1}{N}} ds,\ r \in [0,1]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

It is straightforward to verify that (2.5) is equivalent to the fixed point equation

$$\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2) = (v_1, v_2) \quad \text{in} \quad K.$$

Thus, if $(v_1, v_2) \in K$ is a positive fixed point of $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$, then $(-v_1, -v_2)$ is a convex solution of (1.1). Conversely, if (u_1, u_2) is a convex solution of (1.1), then $(-u_1, -u_2)$ is a fixed point of $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ in K.

The following lemma is a standard result due to the concavity of v, see e.g. [8]. We prove it here only for completeness.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $v(t) \in C^1[0,1]$ for $t \in [0,1]$. If $v(t) \geq 0$ and $v'(t)$ is nonincreasing on $[0,1]$. Then*

$$v(t) \geq \min\{t, 1-t\}||v||, \quad t \in [0,1]$$

where $||v|| = \max_{t\in[0,1]} v(t)$. In particular,

$$\min_{\frac{1}{4}\leq t\leq\frac{3}{4}} v(t) \geq \frac{1}{4}||v||.$$

and if $v(0) = ||v||$, then

$$v(t) \geq (1-t)||v||, t \in [0,1].$$

Proof Since $v'(t)$ is nonincreasing, we have for $0 \le t_0 < t < t_1 \le 1$,

$$v(t) - v(t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t} v'(s)ds \ge (t - t_0)v'(t)$$

and

$$v(t_1) - v(t) = \int_{t}^{t_1} v'(s)ds \le (t_1 - t)v'(t),$$

from which, we have

$$v(t) \ge \frac{(t_1 - t)v(t_0) + (t - t_0)v(t_1)}{t_1 - t_0}.$$

Choosing $\sigma \in [0, 1]$ such that $v(\sigma) = ||v||$ and considering $[t_0, t_1]$ as either of $[0, \sigma]$ and $[\sigma, 1]$, we have

$$v(t) \ge t||v|| \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [0, \sigma],$$

and

$$v(t) \ge (1 - t)||v|| \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [\sigma, 1].$$

Hence,

$$v(t) \ge \min\{t, 1 - t\}||v||, \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

□

$\mathbf{T}_\lambda(K) \subset K$ in Lemma 2.3 is a result of Lemma 2.2. The continuity and compactness of $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ in Lemma 2.3 can be verified by the standard procedures.

Lemma 2.3 *Assume $f, g : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ are continuous. Then $\mathbf{T}_\lambda(K) \subset K$ and $\mathbf{T}_\lambda : K \to K$ is a compact operator and continuous.*

Let

$$\Gamma = \frac{1}{4}\int_{\frac{1}{4}}^{\frac{3}{4}} \Big(\int_{\frac{1}{4}}^{s} N\tau^{N-1}d\tau\Big)^{\frac{1}{N}} ds > 0.$$

Lemma 2.4 *Assume $f, g : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ are continuous. Let $(v_1, v_2) \in K$ and $\eta > 0$. If*

$$f(v_2(t)) \ge (\eta v_2(t))^N \quad \textit{for} \quad t \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}],$$

or

$$g(v_1(t)) \ge (\eta v_1(t))^N \quad \textit{for} \quad t \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}],$$

then

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \ge \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta\|v_2\|,$$

or

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \ge \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta\|v_1\|,$$

respectively.

PROOF Note, from the definition of $\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)$, that $T^i_\lambda(v_1, v_2)(0)$ is the maximum value of $T^i_\lambda(v_1, v_2)$ on [0,1]. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \geq & \sup_{t\in[0,1]} |T^1_\lambda(v_1, v_2)(t)| \\
& \geq \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} \int_{\frac{1}{4}}^{\frac{3}{4}} \Big(\int_{\frac{1}{4}}^{s} N\tau^{N-1} f(v_2(\tau)) d\tau \Big)^{\frac{1}{N}} ds \\
& \geq \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} \int_{\frac{1}{4}}^{\frac{3}{4}} \Big(\int_{\frac{1}{4}}^{s} N\tau^{N-1} (\eta v_2(\tau))^N d\tau \Big)^{\frac{1}{N}} ds \\
& \geq \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} \int_{\frac{1}{4}}^{\frac{3}{4}} \Big(\int_{\frac{1}{4}}^{s} N\tau^{N-1} (\frac{\eta}{4}\|v_2\|)^N d\tau \Big)^{\frac{1}{N}} ds \\
& = \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} \Gamma\eta \|v_2\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \geq \sup_{t\in[0,1]} |T^2_\lambda(v_1, v_2)(t)| \geq \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} \Gamma\eta \|v_1\|.$$

□

We define new functions $\hat{f}(t), \hat{g}(t) : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ by

$$\hat{f}(t) = \max\{f(v) : 0 \leq v \leq t\}, \ \ \hat{g}(t) = \max\{g(v) : 0 \leq v \leq t\}.$$

Note that $\hat{f}_0 = \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\hat{f}(t)}{t^N}$, $\hat{f}_\infty = \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\hat{f}(t)}{t^N}$ and $\hat{g}_0, \hat{g}_\infty$ can be defined similarly.

Lemma 2.5 *[8] Assume $f, g : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ are continuous. Then*

$$\hat{f}_0 = f_0, \ \ \hat{f}_\infty = f_\infty,$$

and

$$\hat{g}_0 = g_0, \ \ \hat{g}_\infty = g_\infty.$$

Lemma 2.6 *Assume $f, g : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ are continuous. Let $r > 0$. If there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\hat{f}(r) \leq (\varepsilon r)^N, \hat{g}(r) \leq (\varepsilon r)^N,$$

then

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \leq 2\varepsilon\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} \|(v_1, v_2)\| \ \text{ for } \ (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_r.$$

Proof From the definition of T, for $(v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| &= \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} |T_\lambda^i(v_1, v_2)(t)| \\
&\leq \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}(\int_0^1 N\tau^{N-1} f(v_2(\tau))d\tau)^{\frac{1}{N}} + \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}(\int_0^1 N\tau^{N-1} g(v_1(\tau))d\tau)^{\frac{1}{N}} \\
&\leq \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}(\int_0^1 N\tau^{N-1} \hat{f}(r)d\tau)^{\frac{1}{N}} + \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}(\int_0^1 N\tau^{N-1} \hat{g}(r)d\tau)^{\frac{1}{N}} \\
&\leq \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}(\int_0^1 N\tau^{N-1} d\tau)^{\frac{1}{N}}\varepsilon r + \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}(\int_0^1 N\tau^{N-1} d\tau)^{\frac{1}{N}}\varepsilon r \\
&= 2\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\varepsilon\|(v_1, v_2)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following two lemmas are weak forms of Lemmas 2.4 and 2.6.

Lemma 2.7 *Assume* $f, g : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ *are continuous and* $f(u), g(u) > 0$ *for* $u > 0$. *Let* $r > 0, (v_1, v_2) \in \Omega_r$. *Then*

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \geq 4\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma(\hat{m}_r)^{\frac{1}{N}},$$

where $\hat{m}_r = \min_{\frac{r}{8}\leq t\leq r}\{\min\{f(t), g(t)\}\} > 0$.

Proof If $(v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_r$, then $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_i \geq \frac{1}{2}r$ must hold for either $i = 1$ or $i = 2$. If $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}r$, then

$$\min_{\frac{1}{4}\leq t\leq\frac{3}{4}} v_2(t) \geq \frac{1}{4}\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_2 \geq \frac{1}{8}r$$

which implies that

$$f(v_2(t)) \geq \hat{m}_r \text{ for t} \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}].$$

Otherwise, we have

$$g(v_1(t)) \geq \hat{m}_r \text{ for t} \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}].$$

It is easy to see that this lemma can be shown in a similar manner as in Lemma 2.4. □

Lemma 2.8 *Assume* $f, g : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ *are continuous and* $f(u), g(u) > 0$ *for* $u > 0$. *Let* $r > 0, (v_1, v_2) \in \Omega_r$. *Then*

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \leq 2\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}(\hat{M}_r)^{\frac{1}{N}},$$

where $\hat{M}_r = \max\{f(t) + g(t) : 0 \leq t \leq r\} > 0$

Proof Since $f(v_1(t)), f(v_1(t)) \leq \hat{M}_r =$ for t $\in [0, 1]$, it is easy to see that this lemma can be shown in a similar manner as in Lemma 2.6. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

PROOF Part (a). It follows from Lemma 2.5 that $\hat{f}_0 = 0, \hat{g}_0 = 0$. Therefore, we can choose $r_1 > 0$ so that $\hat{f}(r_1) \le (\varepsilon r_1)^N, \hat{g}(r_1) \le (\varepsilon r_1)^N$ where the constant $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfies

$$2\varepsilon\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} < 1.$$

We have by Lemma 2.6 that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \le 2\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\varepsilon\|(v_1, v_2)\| < \|(v_1, v_2)\| \quad \text{for} \quad (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_1}.$$

Now, since $f_\infty = \infty, g_\infty = \infty$, there is an $\hat{H} > 0$ such that

$$f(v) \ge (\eta v)^N, g(v) \ge (\eta v)^N$$

for $v \ge \hat{H}$, where $\eta > 0$ is chosen so that

$$\frac{1}{2}\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta > 1.$$

Let $r_2 = \max\{2r_1, 8\hat{H}\}$. If $(v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_2}$, $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_i \ge \frac{1}{2}r_2$ must hold for either $i = 1$ or $i = 2$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_1 \ge \frac{1}{2}r_2$. Then

$$\min_{\frac{1}{4}\le t\le\frac{3}{4}} v_1(t) \ge \frac{1}{4}\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_1 \ge \frac{1}{8}r_2 \ge \hat{H},$$

which implies that

$$g(v_1(t)) \ge (\eta v_1(t))^N \text{ for t} \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}].$$

It follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \ge \Gamma\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\eta\|v_1\| \ge \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta r_2 > r_2 = \|(v_1, v_2)\|.$$

By Lemma 2.1, $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ has a fixed point $(v_1, v_2) \in \Omega_{r_2} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_1}$. The fixed point $(v_1, v_2) \in \Omega_{r_2} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_1}$ is the desired positive solution of (2.5).

Part (b). Since $f_0 = \infty, g_0 = \infty$, there is an $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$f(v) \ge (\eta v)^N, g(v) \ge (\eta v)^N$$

for $0 < v \le r_1$, where $\eta > 0$ is chosen so that

$$\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta > 1.$$

If $(v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_1}$, then

$$f(v_2(t)) \ge (\eta v_2)^N, \;\; g(v_1(t)) \ge (\eta v_1)^N \text{for} \;\; t \in [0, 1].$$

Lemma 2.4 implies that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \ge \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta\|(v_1, v_2)\| > \|(v_1, v_2)\| \quad \text{for} \quad (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_1}.$$

We now determine Ω_{r_2}. It follows from Lemma 2.5 that $\hat{f}_\infty = 0$ and $\hat{g}_\infty = 0$. Therefore there is an $r_2 > 2r_1$ such that

$$\hat{f}(r_2) \leq (\varepsilon r_2)^N, \;\; \hat{g}(r_2) \leq (\varepsilon r_2)^N,$$

where the constant $2\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\varepsilon < 1$. Thus, we have by Lemma 2.6 that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \leq 2\varepsilon\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\|(v_1, v_2)\| < \|(v_1, v_2)\| \quad \text{for} \quad (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_2}.$$

By Lemma 2.1, $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ has a fixed point (v_1, v_2) in $\Omega_{r_2} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_1}$. And (v_1, v_2) is the desired positive solution of (2.5). $\square$

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof Part (a). Fix a number $r_1 > 0$. Lemma 2.7 implies that there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| > \|(v_1, v_2)\| = r_1, \;\; \text{for} \;\; (\mathrm{v}_1, \mathrm{v}_2) \in \partial\Omega_{\mathrm{r}_1}, \lambda > \lambda_0.$$

If $f_0 = g_0 = 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$\hat{f}_0 = \hat{g}_0 = 0.$$

Therefore, we can choose $0 < r_2 < r_1$ so that

$$\hat{f}(r_2) \leq (\varepsilon r_2)^N, \hat{g}(r_2) \leq (\varepsilon r_2)^N$$

where the constant $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfies

$$2\varepsilon\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} < 1.$$

We have by Lemma 2.6 that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \leq 2\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\varepsilon\|(v_1, v_2)\| < \|(v_1, v_2)\| \quad \text{for} \quad (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_2}.$$

If $f_\infty = g_\infty = 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.5 that then $\hat{f}_\infty = \hat{g}_\infty = 0$. Therefore there is an $r_3 > 2r_1$ such that

$$\hat{f}(r_3) \leq (\varepsilon r_3)^N, \hat{g}(r_3) \leq (\varepsilon r_3)^N$$

where the constant $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfies

$$2\varepsilon\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}} < 1.$$

Thus, we have by Lemma 2.6 that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \leq 2\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\varepsilon\|(v_1, v_2)\| < \|(v_1, v_2)\| \quad \text{for} \quad (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_3}.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ has a fixed point in $\Omega_{r_1} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_2}$ or $\Omega_{r_3} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_1}$. Consequently, (2.5) has a positive solution for $\lambda > \lambda_0$.

Part (b). Fix a number $r_1 > 0$. Lemma 2.8 implies that there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| < \|(v_1, v_2)\| = r_1, \text{ for } \mathbf{v} \in \partial\Omega_{r_1},\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_0.$$

If $f_0 = g_0 = \infty$, there is an $0 < r_2 < r_1$ such that

$$f(v) \geq (\eta v)^N, g(v) \geq (\eta v)^N$$

for $0 < v \leq r_2$, where $\eta > 0$ is chosen so that

$$\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta > 1.$$

If $(v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_2}$, then

$$f(v_2(t)) \geq (\eta v_2)^N,\ \ g(v_1(t)) \geq (\eta v_1)^N \text{for } \ t \in [0, 1].$$

Lemma 2.4 implies that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \geq \lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta\|(v_1, v_2)\| > \|(v_1, v_2)\| \quad \text{for} \quad (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_2}.$$

If $f_\infty = g_\infty = \infty$, there is an $\hat{H} > 0$ such that

$$f(v) \geq (\eta v)^N, g(v) \geq (\eta v)^N$$

for $v \geq \hat{H}$, where $\eta > 0$ is chosen so that

$$\frac{1}{2}\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta > 1.$$

Let $r_3 = \max\{2r_1, 8\hat{H}\}$. If $(v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_3}$, $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_i \geq \frac{1}{2}r_3$ must hold for either $i = 1$ or $i = 2$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}r_3$. Then

$$\min_{\frac{1}{4}\leq t\leq\frac{3}{4}} v_1(t) \geq \frac{1}{4}\sup_{t\in[0,1]} v_1 \geq \frac{1}{8}r_3 \geq \hat{H},$$

which implies that

$$g(v_1(t)) \geq (\eta v_1(t))^N \text{ for t} \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}].$$

It follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \geq \Gamma\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\eta\|v_1\| \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\Gamma\eta r_3 > r_3 = \|(v_1, v_2)\|.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ has a fixed point in $\Omega_{r_1} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_2}$ or $\Omega_{r_3} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_1}$. Consequently, (2.5) has a positive solution for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$.

Part (c). Fix two numbers $0 < r_3 < r_4$. Lemma 2.7 implies that there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for $\lambda > \lambda_0$,

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| > \|(v_1, v_2)\|, \text{ for } (\mathrm{v}_1, \mathrm{v}_2) \in \partial\Omega_{\mathrm{r}_\mathrm{i}}, \ (\mathrm{i} = 3, 4).$$

Since $f_0 = g_0 = f_\infty = g_\infty = 0$, it follows from the proof of Theorem 1.2 (a) that we can choose $0 < r_1 < r_3/2$ and $r_2 > 2r_4$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| < \|(v_1, v_2)\|, \text{ for } (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_i}, \ (i = 1, 2).$$

It follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ has two fixed points (v_1, v_2) and (u_1, u_2) such that $(v_1, v_2) \in \Omega_{r_3} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_1}$ and $(u_1, u_2) \in \Omega_{r_2} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_4}$, which are the desired distinct positive solutions of (2.5) for $\lambda > \lambda_0$ satisfying

$$r_1 < \|(v_1, v_2)\| < r_3 < r_4 < \|(u_1, u_2)\| < r_2.$$

Part (d). Fix two numbers $0 < r_3 < r_4$. Lemma 2.8 implies that there exists a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$,

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| < \|(v_1, v_2)\|, \text{ for } (\mathrm{v}_1, \mathrm{v}_2) \in \partial\Omega_{\mathrm{r_i}}, \ (\mathrm{i} = 3, 4).$$

Since $f_0 = g_0 = f_\infty = g_\infty = \infty$, it follows from the proof of Theorem 1.2 (b) that we can choose $0 < r_1 < r_3/2$ and $r_2 > 2r_4$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| > \|(v_1, v_2)\|, \text{ for } (v_1, v_2) \in \partial\Omega_{r_i}, \ (i = 1, 2).$$

It follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ has two fixed points (v_1, v_2) and (u_1, u_2) such that $(v_1, v_2) \in \Omega_{r_3} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_1}$ and $(u_1, u_2) \in \Omega_{r_2} \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{r_4}$, which are the desired distinct positive solutions of (2.5) for $\lambda < \lambda_0$ satisfying

$$r_1 < \|(v_1, v_2)\| < r_3 < r_4 < \|(u_1, u_2)\| < r_2.$$

Part (e). Since $f_0, g_0, f_\infty, g_\infty < \infty$, it follows that $\hat{f}_0, \hat{g_0}, \hat{f}_\infty, \hat{g}_\infty < \infty$ and there exist positive numbers ε_1^i, ε_2^i, r_1^i and r_2^i such that $r_1^i < r_2^i, i = 1, 2$,

$$\hat{f}(v) \le \varepsilon_1^1 v^N \text{ for } 0 \le \mathrm{v} \le \mathrm{r}_1^1, \quad \hat{\mathrm{g}}(\mathrm{v}) \le \varepsilon_1^2 \mathrm{v}^\mathrm{N} \text{ for } 0 \le \mathrm{v} \le \mathrm{r}_1^2,$$

and

$$\hat{f}(v) \le \varepsilon_2^1 v^N \text{ for } \mathrm{v} \ge \mathrm{r}_2^1, \quad \hat{\mathrm{g}}(\mathrm{v}) \le \varepsilon_2^2 \mathrm{v}^\mathrm{N} \text{ for } \mathrm{v} \ge \mathrm{r}_2^2,$$

Let

$$\varepsilon^1 = \max\{\varepsilon_1^1, \varepsilon_2^1, \max\{\frac{\hat{f}(v)}{v^N} : r_1^1 \le v \le r_2^1\}\} > 0$$

$$\varepsilon^2 = \max\{\varepsilon_1^2, \varepsilon_2^2, \max\{\frac{\hat{g}(v)}{v^N} : r_1^2 \le v \le r_2^2\}\} > 0$$

and $\varepsilon = (\max\limits_{i=1,2}\{\varepsilon^i\})^{\frac{1}{N}} > 0$. Thus, we have

$$\hat{f}(v) \le (\varepsilon v)^N, \ \ \hat{g}(v) \le (\varepsilon v)^N \text{ for } \mathrm{v} \ge 0.$$

Assume $(v_1(t), v_2(t))$ is a positive solution of (2.5). We will show that this leads to a contradiction for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$, where

$$\lambda_0 = (\frac{1}{2\varepsilon})^N.$$

In fact, for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$, since $\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1(t), v_2(t)) = (v_1(t), v_2(t))$ for $t \in [0,1]$, by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(v_1, v_2)\| &= \|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\|(v_1, v_2)\| \\ &< \|(v_1, v_2)\| \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Part (f). Since $f_0, g_0, f_\infty, g_\infty > 0$, there exist positive numbers ε_1^i, ε_2^i, r_1^i and r_2^i such that $r_1^i < r_2^i, i = 1, 2$,

$$f(v) \geq \varepsilon_1^1 v^N \text{ for } 0 \leq \mathrm{v} \leq \mathrm{r}_1^1, \quad \mathrm{g(v)} \geq \varepsilon_1^2 \mathrm{v}^\mathrm{N} \text{ for } 0 \leq \mathrm{v} \leq \mathrm{r}_1^2,$$

and

$$f(v) \geq \varepsilon_2^1 v^N \text{ for } \mathrm{v} \geq \mathrm{r}_2^1, \quad \mathrm{g(v)} \geq \varepsilon_2^2 \mathrm{v}^\mathrm{N} \text{ for } \mathrm{v} \geq \mathrm{r}_2^2,$$

Let

$$\varepsilon^1 = \min\{\varepsilon_1^1, \varepsilon_2^1, \min\{\frac{f(v)}{v^N} : r_1^1 \leq v \leq r_2^1\}\} > 0$$

$$\varepsilon^2 = \min\{\varepsilon_1^2, \varepsilon_2^2, \min\{\frac{g(v)}{v^N} : r_1^2 \leq v \leq r_2^2\}\} > 0$$

and $\varepsilon = (\min\limits_{i=1,2}\{\varepsilon^i\})^{\frac{1}{N}} > 0$. Thus, we have

$$f(v) \geq (\varepsilon v)^N, \;\; g(v) \geq (\varepsilon v)^N \text{ for } \mathrm{v} \geq 0.$$

Assume $(v_1(t), v_2(t))$ is a positive solution of (2.5). We will show that this leads to a contradiction for $\lambda > \lambda_0 = (\frac{1}{\Gamma\varepsilon})^N$. In fact, since $\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1(t), v_2(t)) = (v_1(t), v_2(t))$ for $t \in [0,1]$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that, for $\lambda > \lambda_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(v_1, v_2)\| &= \|\mathbf{T}_\lambda(v_1, v_2)\| \\ &\geq \Gamma\varepsilon\lambda^{\frac{1}{N}}\|(v_1, v_2)\| \\ &> \|(v_1, v_2)\|, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. □

References

[1] L. Caffarelli and Y.Y. Li, An extension to a theorem of Jrgens, Calabi, and Pogorelov. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 56 (2003), 549-583.

[2] Ph. Delano, Radially symmetric boundary value problems for real and complex elliptic Monge-Ampère equations. J. Differential Equations 58 (1985), 318–344

[3] S. Hu and H. Wang, Convex Solutions of boundary Value Problems Arising from Monge-Ampère Equations, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, 16(2006), 705-720.

[4] J.V.A. Goncalves and C.A.P. Santos, Classical solutions of singular Monge-Ampère equation in a ball, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 305 (2005), 240–252.

[5] D. Guo and V. Lakshmikantham, "Nonlinear Problems in Abstract Cones," Academic Press, Orlando, FL, 1988.

[6] M. Krasnoselskii, Positive solutions of operator equations, Noordhoff, Groningen, 1964.

[7] N. D. Kutev, Nontrivial solutions for the equations of Monge-Ampère type. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 132 (1988), 424-433

[8] H. Wang, On the number of positive solutions of nonlinear systems, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 281(2003) 287-306.

[9] H. Wang, Convex Solutions of boundary value problems, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 318(2006) 246-252.

[10] H. Wang, Convex solutions of systems arising from Monge-Ampère equations, Electronic Journal of Qualitative Theory of Differential Equations, Special Edition I, 26(2009) 1-8.

[11] H. Wang, Convex solutions of systems of Monge-Ampère equations, arXiv:1007.3013.